COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 1231-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 342

Subject: Retirement Systems and Benefits - General

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: February 14, 2003

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

L.R. No. 1231-01 Bill No. SB 342 Page 2 of 4 February 14, 2003

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Local Government	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials with the **City of Kansas City** assume this proposal would have a substantial negative impact on the City Firefighters' Pension Fund. The amount of that impact cannot be determined at this time as the incidence of cancer among City firefighters is unknown.

Officials with the **Kansas City Firefighters' Pension System** assume this proposal will result in some increase in costs over time, as it would likely lead to higher numbers of duty disability pensions being granted, but the incremental amount in any given fiscal year cannot be determined at this time.

Officials with the **Local Government Employees Retirement System** assume the benefits paid out of the retirement system would increase. Depending upon the level of increase in disability an death-in-service benefits due to the reclassification from non-duty to duty, an increase in computed employer contribution rates may be required in the future.

The **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement (JCPER)** has reviewed this proposal and has determined an actuarial study is not needed under the provisions of section 105.660, subdivision (5).

VAL:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 1231-01 Bill No. SB 342 Page 3 of 4 February 14, 2003

<u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

In a similar proposal officials with the **County Employees Retirement System and Department of Insurance** assume no fiscal impact to their agency

Officials with the City of St. Louis and Firemen's Retirement System of St. Louis, in a similar proposal, indicated \$275,000 to be contributed by the City of St. Louis.

Officials with the **City of Columbia** indicated their City Fire Pension does not differentiate between duty and non duty injuries and so the proposal would have not fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the City of Jefferson and Eureka Fire Protection District did not respond.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2004 (10 Mo.)	FY 2005	FY 2006
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2004 (10 Mo.)	FY 2005	FY 2006
<u>Cost</u> - Various City and Firefighter Retirement Systems	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

DESCRIPTION

This act adds various forms of cancer to the diseases currently presumed to be suffered by firemen in the line of duty.

VAL:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 1231-01 Bill No. SB 342 Page 4 of 4 February 14, 2003

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

County Employees Retirement Fund
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement
Local Government Retirement System
Department of Insurance
Firemen's Retirement System of St. Louis
Kansas City Firefighters' Pension
City of Kansas City
City of St. Louis
City of Columbia

NOT RESPONDING

City of Jefferson City Eureka Fire Protection District

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Director

February 14, 2003